

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Official Action of July 30, 2004, relating to the above-identified application.

It is noted with appreciation that the Official Action no longer relies on any of the references set forth in the previous Official Action of February 12, 2004, and, therefore, it is presumed that all the prior rejections and related references have been withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 and 14-23 stand withdrawn from further consideration and applicants reserve the right to file divisional applications directed to the withdrawn claims.

The rejection of Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by *Tobol* (US 5,253,252) is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 is directed to a multiplex communication method comprising:

determining a transmitting node obtaining a data transmission right based on a token circulated among a plurality of nodes;

transmitting data by specifying another specific node as a transmission destination from the node obtaining said data transmission right;

obtaining clock information by the node having said data transmission right; and

adding the obtained clock information to the data to be transmitted.

Applicants respectfully submit that the *Tobol* reference does not anticipate each and every element set forth in the claims.

More specifically, as explained by the reference in col. 8, lines 35-66, the TIME__SYNC frame or the DELTA__TIME frame is transmitted and received separately from the TOKEN frame. This particular reference points out that each of the devices has a sequence register in a

DELTA__TIME counter which counts milliseconds. When the device receives a TIME__SYNC frame, the device loads the sequence number from the frame into the sequence register of the device and compares the elapsed time of the TIME__SYNC frame to the current DELTA__TIME count in the DELTA__TIME counter of the device.

The reference does not disclose adding the obtained clock information (time) to the data to be transmitted as defined in Claim 11. The clock information is obtained from the node having the data transmission right and that data is added to the clock information. The Official Action cites col. 8, lines 61-66 in support of the rejection. In that portion of the reference, the reference merely explains that if the sequence number in the token is not equal to the sequence number held in the sequence register of the device, the device then recognizes that it failed to receive the last TIME__SYNC message and then sends a REQUEST__DELTA__TIME message to the current bus master. Nothing in the passage at col. 8, lines 61-66, or any other passage in the reference, refers to adding the clock information obtained from the node having the data transmission right to the data to be transmitted.

It is therefore submitted that the *Tobel* reference fails to anticipate the claim that has been rejected, namely, Claim 11, and, therefore, also fails to anticipate Claims 12 and 13, since they depend on Claim 11.

The reference fails to describe the presently claimed invention and therefore the rejection is improper and therefore should be withdrawn.

New Claim 24 is supported by the disclosure on page 26, lines 3-19 of the original application and is patentable over the references cited for the same reasons since the claim specifies the details of the method of Claim 11. New Claim 25 represents a combination of the

App. No. 09/615,777
Amend. dated Oct. 26, 2004
Resp to Office Action dated July 30, 2004

subject matter of original Claim 11 and new Claim 24 and is considered to be patentable for reasons stated above.

Favorable action in view of the foregoing is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: 
Robert G. Weilacher, Reg. No. 20,531

Suite 3100, Promenade II
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3592
Telephone: (404) 815-3593
Facsimile: (404) 685-6893